



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/981,484

10/17/2001

Edward G. Callway

00100.01.0069

6461

29153

7590

06/13/2006

ATI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

C/O VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ, P.C.

222 N.LASALLE STREET

CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

HSU, JONI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2628

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No. 09/981,484	Applicant(s) CALLWAY, EDWARD G.	
	Examiner Joni Hsu	Art Unit 2628	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: see attached sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: 20.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 29-39.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
 13. ☐ Other: _____.


ULKA CHAUHAN
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Applicant argues that the office action did not give any meaning to the word “graphics” in the words “graphics device” set forth in claim 1. Graphics devices such as video graphic adapters as noted in Applicant’s Specification, perform graphic calculations (e.g., lighting operations etc.). Normile (US005461679A) fails to describe a system that employs multiple graphics devices and output ports as claimed (page 2).

In reply, the Examiner disagrees. It is well-known in the art that many times the words “graphics device” and “video device” are taken to mean the same thing, and therefore a “graphics device” is taken to be the same as a “video device”, so the video devices of Normile are taken to be the graphics devices as claimed. Applicant argues that the video devices of Normile do not perform graphic calculations such as lighting operations as noted in the specification, but limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

Applicant argues that Taylor (US00611846A) does not teach that the display controllers each render respective frames of video (page 3).

In reply, the Examiner disagrees. Taylor describes that the frame buffer stores words of graphics or video data defining the color/gray-shade of each pixel of an **entire display frame** (Col. 1, lines 40-43). Since each display controller renders video data for a frame buffer (Col. 5, line 65-Col. 6, line 1; Col. 6, lines 50-61; Col. 7, lines 11-30), the display controllers each render respective frames of video.

Applicant argues that the connector of Jordan (US006028643A) is not an output node as claimed since the signals from the video monitor interface component 245 and 255 are not

coupled to one another at a first output node and the signals coming from the video monitor interface components 245 and 255 are routed in separate wires to two different monitors (page 3).

In reply, the Examiner disagrees. Claim 19 simply recites that the first signal and the second signal are both provided to the first node, and Jordan describes that the signals from the video monitor interface component 245 and 255 are both provided to the first node 247 (Figure 2A; Col. 6, lines 45-47, Col. 5, lines 62-64).

Applicant argues that the cited references do not teach adjusting the second device until a value of the second signal at the first output node substantially matches the determined value of the signal of the first signal at the first output node as required (page 4).

In reply, the Examiner disagrees. Jordan describes that the first and second signals are both provided to the first output node, as discussed above. Gonsalves (US006847373B1) describes making color modifications to correct color errors due to process errors (Col. 1, lines 26-29). Such corrections include matching colors and tones from shot to shot (Col. 1, lines 34-38). Gonsalves describes adjusting the values of the selected destination color component for color matching (Col. 3, lines 42-50; Col. 24, lines 16-19). Therefore, combining Jordan and Gonsalves, it would be obvious to adjust the second device until a value of the second signal at the first output node substantially matches the determined value of the first signal at the first output node.